



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*bw*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,188	05/08/2001	Yih Chang	JCLA6418	4191
7590	07/28/2005		EXAMINER	
J.C. Patents, Inc. 4 VENTURE SUITE 250 Irvine, CA 92618				MITCHELL, JAMES M
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2813		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/852,188	CHANG-YIH
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	James M. Mitchell	2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 15-19 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed May 3, 2005.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (U.S. 6,776,880) in combination with Burrows et al. U.S 6,013,538)

Yamazuki (Fig 3) discloses a mass production packaging means, comprising at least a panel feeding system (portion of arm, 105 that substrate, 104 is on), a UV system (304), a product output system (i.e.. Remove from arm) and transport system bound by an arm (105) and atmosphere control system (107), a sizing system to apply a surface with a molding compound (301).

Yamazuki does not appear to disclose a lid alignment system for applying a metal lid.

Burrows utilize a lid alignment system (Col. 2, Lines 20-39) for applying a metal lid (Col. 6, Lines 37-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a lid alignment system to the system of Yamazuki in order to protect diode<sup>1</sup> as taught by Burrows (Col. 2, Lines 20-39).

With respect to the intended use limitations that "heads ... moving in X, Y, Z direction," it does not impart patentability since the prior art forms the same structure as applicants, and it has been held that the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamazaki (U.S. 6,776,880) in combination with Burrows et al. U.S 6,013,538) as applied to claim 15 and further in combination with Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0017864).

While Yamazaki teaches a UV resin, neither it nor Burrows disclose the molding material as a UV paste, however Watanabe teaches using a UV paste for mold. (Par. 0469).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the mold material of Yamazaki from a UV paste in order to provide a mold as UV cure material as required by Yamazaki (Col. 7, Lines 45-56).

### ***Response to Arguments***

---

<sup>1</sup> While the prior references oled, any assortment of machines capable of producing the claimed process

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In an effort to expedite prosecution, examiner has addressed arguments that may be applicable. Applicant contends that Burrows does not disclose a lid, but rather a cap, which is different than the lid of the present invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since a cap is within the broad scope of a lid, and applicant has failed to affirmatively claim features that would distinguish a lid from a cap, applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive.

Likewise applicant contends that the invention is patentable over the prior art, because Watanabe fails to disclose UV paste for packaging OEL devices. Examiner agrees. Nevertheless, because molding of devices was already known in the art, and Watanabe was only relied on to show the use of UV paste as a type of molding material applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-14 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art does not disclose or make obvious a packaging means for organic luminescent display panel including a panel feeding system, the use of a UV pretreatment system, a UV irradiation system and lid feeding system including all the limitations of the independent claims. In contrast to the prior art that shows a system including a single UV system.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-1931. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jmm  
July 24, 2005

*Carl M. Mitchell*  
CARL WHITEHEAD, JR.  
SUPPLYING PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800